

posed plan of friends of Roosevelt to bring about the nomination in 1912 of their favorite. Viewed as a 'conspiracy' it is an interesting mate to the anti-Roosevelt 'conspiracy' talked of two years ago wherein reactionaries were supposed to be plotting against the last administration as certain reformers are alleged to be doing against the present one. President Roosevelt was laughed at for giving credit to the supposed conspiracy against himself. It is to be hoped President Taft's views are too positively stated by 'men who are in position to know.' There may be radical opposition to Taft as there was reactionary opposition to Roosevelt, but in this land of free speech and ballot, opposition needs not involve a 'plot.' Indeed, if there is any 'plot' in this connection it is most likely involved in the effort to convince the president that there is one. The interest of the standpatters in convincing the president that the insurgents are planning to discredit his administration and prevent his nomination and re-election is obvious. It would tend to identify the president with the standpatters and to discredit, in a party sense, the insurgents whom standpatters hate far more deeply than they hate the opposition party. Mr. Taft should be too wise to be caught in this trap. His nomination and election on a progressive platform came from insurgent territory. If there is any widespread disposition to judge him and his work finally without a further trial, that is not manifest in this part of the insurgent country. Far from desiring to discredit the Taft administration the great progressive west desires nothing so much as that the administration may be so great a credit to itself that no reason for opposing it will arise."

IN A SOMEWHAT hysterical editorial the New York Herald says: "The longest lane has a turning and at last, thank God, the nation has peace and the White House is occupied by a statesman of conservative tendencies and a well balanced mind. The change from Roosevelt Rough Riderism to Mr. Taft's solicitude for the country's interests is so grateful that the last two presidential terms seem like a horrible nightmare."

COMMENTING UPON the Herald's remarks the Omaha World-Herald says: "If we might be permitted to make so bold we would suggest one or two amendments. One is that in testifying to 'Mr. Taft's solicitude for the country's interests' the word 'interests' be enclosed in special quotation marks of its own. There will then be no possibility of our contemporary's meaning being misunderstood by the hasty reader. Another suggestion is that, after due thanks are piously given for whatever share providence may be thought to have had in giving us Mr. Taft for president, thanks be also extended to other influential sources. First of all, 'Roosevelt Rough Riderism' itself must be thanked. If Mr. Roosevelt had not delegated Frank Hitchcock to rough ride the south for delegates, and if he had not himself swung his terrible Big Stick over the north and west, Mr. Taft would not have been made his party nominee in that memorable convention in Chicago over which Henry Cabot Lodge presided, whose platform was reported by Albert J. Hopkins, and whose vice presidential candidate was named by Joseph G. Cannon. Afterward, thanks should be offered in a good many quarters. To John D. Rockefeller and Pierpont Morgan, to all the powerful representatives of 'the country's interests,' to Achille Ballinger, to the Mormon church, to Apostle Smoot and Brother Henry, and to others too numerous to mention. Gratitude is a becoming virtue, but it should be fairly distributed."

A "MODEST LITTLE item" published in the New York Evening Post is interpreted by the Omaha World-Herald in this interesting way: "It appears that on Tuesday last the directors of the First National declared a special dividend of 8 per cent on the capital stock of \$10,000,000. This is in addition to the regular quarterly dividend of 8 per cent; and makes altogether 40 per cent of profits this year. It is narrated further that when the First National was doing business under its old capital of \$500,000, its dividend rate was 100 per cent annually. In 1902 the capital was increased to \$10,000,000. To commemorate this auspicious occasion there was paid in surplus earnings, the largest special dividend ever paid by a national bank—1,900 per cent! In other words, for every \$1,000 of stock there was paid a special dividend of \$19,000. That divi-

dend enabled the capital to be increased to \$10,000,000, without any of the stockholders being out a single penny beyond their original investment on the \$500,000 basis. Thereafter, up to 1906, annual dividends of 20 per cent were paid on the \$10,000,000. Since 1906 dividends were 32 per cent, and this year they are 40 per cent. Now, 40 per cent dividend on \$10,000,000 amounts to \$4,000,000. This is 800 per cent on the original investment of \$500,000 which has been increased, out of the earnings wholly, to \$10,000,000. It is not so bad for a philanthropist—800 per cent every year on his investment. But even this fails to tell the whole story. For in May, 1908, the officers of the bank organized the First Security company, to engage in stock, real estate and other ventures on a large scale, and to take over the bank's holdings of stocks. This new company, like the bank, was capitalized at \$10,000,000—and this entire capitalization was also paid by a special dividend of 100 per cent out of the inexhaustible earnings of the bank! The original investment of a half million, therefore, has been converted, since 1902, into a capitalization of twenty millions, one-half of which is earning 800 per cent on the investment, and the other half is earning we don't know what. But that it is enough—that it represents dividends that are rich and fat and juicy, is certain; the certainty is due to the fact that the eminent almoner, Mr. Morgan is holding the reins. The World-Herald desires to propound, to its intelligent readers, a little mathematical problem: When a man like Mr. Morgan takes \$500,000 and starts a national bank; when, out of the earnings, he increases the capitalization to \$10,000,000, and also out of the earnings starts a trust company with \$10,000,000 capital; when he earns annually out of both, let us say to be conservative, 1,000 per cent on the amount of money he put in to the deal—who pays it? Where does all that money come from? It hasn't been gained by producing anything; it hasn't been produced by farming or mining or fishing or manufacturing or lumbering. It has been 'earned' simply by accepting money on deposit, and loaning that money, and dealing in securities of various kinds. The sum total of wealth for all that the bank has done, is the same as it was in the beginning. But the bank originally had \$500,000. Now it has \$20,000,000—and its dividends are enormous. Who pays?"

A GALVESTON, Texas, dispatch to the New York World says: "There will not be one white woman in either of the Texas state penitentiaries on Christmas day. Mrs. Agnes Goode, who murdered her husband, is the only white woman in either of the state penitentiaries, and Governor Campbell has pardoned her, so that she will be set free on Christmas eve." Within the last few days five other women prisoners have been pardoned on the recommendation of the pardon board, which also advised the release of twenty-five male prisoners. Mrs. Goode was sentenced to thirty-five years, and she has served a small part of her term. The others who were liberated were short term prisoners. "The world will be none the better for keeping this unfortunate woman in prison for thirty-five years," said Governor Campbell."

SENATOR LAFOLLETTE is doomed so far as the republican administration is concerned. Under a Milwaukee date line the newspapers printed this dispatch: "All doubt as to President Taft's hostility to Senator LaFollette is ended. There will be no more friendly or ostensibly friendly relations between them. It will be open war without any direct declaration of war. President Taft will not appoint W. J. McElroy whom the senator long ago recommended for the federal attorneyship, nor will he appoint G. E. Schulz for collector of customs at Milwaukee nor will he recognize LaFollette in any other appointment or in any other way. All of LaFollette's federal patronage will go to Senator Stephenson and State Chairman Edmonds, a Stephenson man. A Washington dispatch to the Boston Transcript, a republican newspaper, says: "The republican leaders of the senate have definitely decided to hold no counsel with and pay no attention to anything Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin may do. They do not agree with Speaker Cannon in ruling out of the party Senator Cummins and other republicans who voted against the tariff bill, but they say that LaFollette voted against them so much as to constitute himself a democrat and henceforth he will be treated as if he were one of the minority party." Another Washington dispatch, sent to the New York Tribune, says: "There is an ap-

parent effort in some quarters to create the impression that the insurgent republicans are no longer welcome at the White House, and that their recommendations with regard to patronage are being received with scant courtesy. The impression is wholly erroneous, and grows out of the attitude of the White House toward Senator LaFollette and those members of the Wisconsin delegation in the house who do the bidding of the junior senator. Senator Dolliver, Senator Cummins, and indeed all others who voted against the tariff bill, find no difference in their reception at the White House, and the same is true of the house insurgents, with the exception of the little group of Wisconsin members referred to. So, too, in the case of patronage, the recommendations of all insurgents, with the exception of Mr. LaFollette and his henchmen, receive as much consideration from this administration as did the recommendations of the same men in the past."

THE ALDRICH and Taft forces seem to take more kindly to Senator Cummins than they took to Senator LaFollette, but some of Senator Cummins' friends thinks this bodes no good to the Iowa senator. The Des Moines Register and Leader, which is very friendly to Senator Cummins, says: "The rumors floating about in the eastern newspapers to the effect that Senator LaFollette is to be segregated and abandoned are put in definite form by the Washington correspondent of the New York Tribune in the following statement: 'Senator Aldrich appears to realize the utility of 'the wedge formation' quite as much as any football captain, and he is skilfully driving a wedge through the ranks of the insurgents. Unless all indications fail, when the play is completed Senator LaFollette and the few extremists who follow his lead will find themselves isolated, while Senator Cummins and his followers, whom the leaders term 'reasonable insurgents,' will be safely inside the organization fold, with some material victories in the line of progressive legislation to their credit. Senator Crawford has already been weaned away from LaFolletism, largely through the skilful manipulation of Mr. Root, and other former insurgents have begun to see the light. Mr. Aldrich consults Mr. Cummins at every turn, according him that deferential consideration due the leader of an important faction, and at the same time exceedingly grateful to the self respect of a senator who is at once progressive and sincere.' Inasmuch as Senator Cummins has not heretofore been classed among the 'reasonable insurgents' it will take something more than Washington gossip to convince his Iowa friends that he has chosen a middle course. But he will soon be in Iowa again, where he will announce his own program, pending which speculation is not worth the trouble. There are a few things, however, it is worth the time of the insurgents, progressives, or Roosevelt men, however they be called, to be considering, in view of the rapidly developing situation. One of these is that Senator LaFollette is not being proscribed because of any personal eccentricities, nor because he has mortally offended any of the republican leaders—he is being proscribed because he is uncompromising. Another thing worth getting firmly in mind is this, that no matter how many earmarks of reform the legislation, Senator Aldrich consents to, may bear, no legislation will pass this congress with the acquiescence of the organization that is reformatory in fact. There is no doubt that Senator LaFollette has been on many occasions a trial to his friends. He is not a man to work well with others. He is eccentric and often unreasonable. But it will never do to forget that it has been Senator LaFollette who has traveled the country over, reading the records of recalcitrant senators, telling the people just what has been going on, setting the prairies afire, and creating the sentiment that has made the middle west insurgent. Without LaFollette it may safely be said that much that has been done in Iowa could not have been done. The defeat of LaFollette in Wisconsin by a combination of eastern money and western indifference would be a body blow at the progressive movement. The insurgent movement either ventured too much in the last session of congress or it would be cowardly now to turn back. We can never know that it ventured too much until it has taken a test of public sentiment. To abandon the cause now or to abandon any of the leaders of the cause, before it is shown that the movement was unjustified—to allow Senator Aldrich to cut the pickets off one by one, and shape the legislation of this congress—will be a desertion the people will find it hard to forgive."